

BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 653-8007
(916) 653-0989 FAX
Website: www.bof.fire.ca.gov



MINUTES JOINT STATE WATER BOARD, AND BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION MEETING June 4, 2003 Sonora, California

BOARD OF FORESTRY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stan Dixon, Chairman
Kirk Marckwald, Vice Chair
Mark Bosetti
Susan Britting
Robert Heald
David Nawi
Tharon O'Dell
Gary Ryneerson

WATER BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Arthur G. Baggett, Jr., Chairman
Peter S. Silva, Vice Chairman
Gary Carlton
Nancy Sutley

WATER BOARD STAFF PRESENT:

Tom Howard, Assistant Executive Director

BOARD STAFF PRESENT:

Daniel R. Sendek, Executive Officer
George Gentry
Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing
Donna Stadler, Executive Assistant
Jim Mote, Regulations Coordinator

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF PRESENT:

Andrea Tuttle, Director
Bill Snyder, Deputy Director
Resource Management

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dixon called the June 2003 Joint meeting of the State Water Board (Water Board) and the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) to order. He welcomed the Water Board and thanked them for joining the Board for this meeting.

Mr. Art Baggett, Water Board Chairman, introduced the members of the Water Board. He commented that the goals of the Water Board are to protect, preserve, and to restore the beneficial uses of the waters of the State, not to stop timber production. He commented on three agenda items: 1) The MOU between the Water Board and the Department, a document designed to allow early intervention when disputes arise; 2) The Interagency Monitoring

Work Group, and their task of reviewing monitoring strategies; and the Management Agency agreement (MAA) between the Water Board, CDF, and the Board. He expressed a desire for members from the respective boards to review the documents for the purpose of updating them.

Director Tuttle expressed her appreciation for the time she was able to spend in the field with the members of the Water Board. She believes such trips are an effective method for illustrating the issues.

Chairman Baggett commented that the Director of Forestry, the Executive Officer of the State Water Board, as well as Regional Board Executive Officers from the Central Valley Region, the Coastal Region, and the North Coast Region have signed the MOU. The MOU is on the agenda for Region Six next week and the expectation is that it will be signed by that Board's Executive Officer. The hope is that through the MOU, conflicts may be resolved at the THP review level instead of the Regional Board level. He believes that it would be good to evaluate the MOU in six months to determine if the goals have been met.

Mr. Gary Carlton, Water Board Member, commented that the MOU was designed to address procedural issues that were the source of some problems.

Mr. Bill Snyder, Deputy Director of Resource Management, commented that the Department and agencies have put together a procedure for the conflict resolution process in the MOU relating to the issues of cumulative effects and monitoring, he would report on later in the day.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to know if the process outlined in the MOU was being utilized currently.

Mr. Snyder replied that it was, but no issues requiring that process have occurred as yet

Mr. Tom Howard, Deputy Director for the Water Board, commented that the principle focus of the MOU was the conflict resolution process. Within the MOU, monitoring elements and cumulative watershed impacts were incorporated, but it became clear that there was a need for more input for those elements. It was decided that an alternative process to address those issues would be necessary. A working group for each was established, in accordance with the MOU.

Ms. Britting wanted to know if the CEQA process in THPs and the water quality standards in the Basin Plans were synthesized in a new way in the MOU.

Mr. Snyder commented that the MOU looks at how to resolve conflicts following the second review, which should expedite resolution.

Chairman Dixon introduced the discussion on the Interagency Monitoring Working Group.

Mr. John Munn, CDF Resource Management, provided an update on the progress of the Interagency Working Group for the Board. He noted that there had been two meetings and a third is scheduled for later this month. A third draft Monitoring Agreement should be ready for review by the end of the month.

Mr. Nawi wanted to know where the resources for monitoring would come from.

Mr. Munn commented that the funding issue was not the charge of the Working Group's initial draft agreement.

Mr. Gaylon Lee, State Water Board, commented that there is a need for the agencies to look at the funding issue.

Mr. Munn commented that the funding issue could be included, if necessary.

Mr. Nawi believes that it is an important issue. However, he expressed doubts about the Working Group as the proper vehicle to look into funding sources.

Chairman Dixon agreed with Member Nawi.

Mr. Lee believes that it is important to prioritize so that whatever funding is available, there will be a sense of where it should go.

Ms. Nancy Sutley, State Water Board, wanted to know what kind of discussions there were on baseline monitoring and establishing initial conditions and when or where that might be appropriate.

Mr. Munn commented that there was discussion regarding various types of monitoring not directly related to projects, and where the timelines involved would allow for that kind of control.

Mr. Marckwald believes that if this is something that is required for either or both entities to be doing their jobs as required by law, there needs to be a way to be creative in finding funds and not just rely on existing state sources.

Mr. Munn reviewed the various monitoring programs that are ongoing. He does not believe that it is a question of having funds, but how to best direct them.

Mr. Marckwald requested a synopsis of all of those other activities that are being undertaken by various parties both public and private.

Chairman Dixon introduced the discussion on Departmental and Interagency Cumulative Watershed Effects Work Groups.

Mr. Bill Snyder, Deputy Director of Resource Management, reported that they had one meeting of the Cumulative Watershed Effects Working Group and that Member Nawi had attended. There was a generalized discussion, and the Group was able to identify and develop strategies for pursuing some of the interim issues. As an example, one issue involves exploring how cumulative effects are currently dealt with in the THP process.

Mr. Snyder commented that the Water Board would continue to do a type of assessment similar to that used in the NCWAP as part of its ongoing TMDL process. The Department of Fish and Game will continue to use its NCWAP staff in looking at Coho recovery issues. CDF is looking at a way to re-direct its NCWAP staff to continue to collect data and analysis related to cumulative effects. The Group wanted to get a clear sense of the agencies' direction, to develop a process to maintain communication between the agencies, and to share data between the agencies.

Mr. Snyder noted that Water Board staff has developed a matrix that deals with evaluations and conflict analysis. The Group will look at this matrix as a way of providing RPFs and others information on how to make decisions when there is insufficient data to support their conclusions. The California Geological Survey will also provide some draft language that they have developed regarding technical notes and reports.

Mr. Snyder commented that regarding the IWMA process, there is one proposal moving forward. The IWMA process requires pre-consultation and agency involvement.

Mr. Snyder noted that the Dunne Report project has been put on hold due to the lack of funding.

Mr. Snyder announced that there will be another meeting of the Group and he should be able to report back to the Board during its July meeting.

Mr. Heald encouraged the Group to keep the process associated with developing the analytical techniques that were a part of the Dunne Report.

Mr. Snyder replied that the techniques are part of the long-term objectives.

Chairman Dixon introduced the topic of updating the existing Management Agency Agreement (MAA) between the Water Resources Control Board, Board of Forestry, and the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Mr. Gaylon Lee, State Water Board, commented that the current MAA was adopted in 1988. However, the regulatory landscape has changed since the adoption. He noted that the current MAA does not reflect the Coastal

Zone Act Reauthorization Amendment and the development of the state's Non-Point Source Program. He believes that the out-dated commitments should be removed from the MAA. He noted that aquatic habitat is not addressed in the current MAA. Aquatic habitat for threatened and endangered species is a designated beneficial use of water. He believes that this issue could result in another MOU with Fish and Game. There is a need to address the Clean Water Act 303(d) rule requirements. The listing of water bodies and developing TMDLs is one of the highest priorities of the Water Board. It would be appropriate to determine what should be done in the MAA to reflect whatever the current understanding is between the agencies as to the process for addressing listings or the development of TMDLs and their associated implementation plans. There are other changes that could be made in the MAA. He believes that those remaining portions of the suggested amendments to the Forest Practice Rules (1999) that have not been fully realized could possibly be included in the MAA.

Mr. Nawi wanted to know when the draft of amendments would be available for review.

Mr. Lee commented that Chairman Baggett is looking at the possibility of having some of the respective Board members to work on the amendments to the MAA.

Mr. Ryneanson wanted to know if the five-year plan was under Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA).

Mr. Lee replied that the plan was under CZARA. It is the state's Non-Point Source Management program.

Mr. Ryneanson commented that Board staff had prepared a memo that identified the number of actions that have taken place regarding the 1999 proposed rulemaking package. It was to determine which issues have already been covered and which are pending. He believes that the last action was to get together with the Water Board and other Regional Boards to try and update that 1999 package and have it fresh for 2003 defining outstanding issues.

Mr. Lee replied that that was correct.

Mr. Marckwald believes that defining those remaining issues is a priority.

Mr. Ryneanson wanted to know about the potential certification under the 208.

Mr. Lee indicated that was a question requiring legal review. The Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) consists of those rules identified in the MAA as Best Management Practices plus the process for promulgating and implementing the rules plus the MAA decisions. He believes that those three pieces together comprise the WQMP. The 208 process is no longer in effect. It is not clear what process the EPA would use given an approval at this time.

Chairman Dixon asked Mr. Lee to summarize his comments regarding the Liaison meeting.

Mr. Lee commented that the Liaison meeting covered the same topics as have been discussed here today. He believes that it is to everyone's interest, in terms of being effective and efficient as state agencies and good servants of public interests, to work out some of these issues; and that there is a need to have an overview independent of the project. During the Liaison meeting, there was an interest for trying to understand how to look at both of those aspects. With monitoring, he believes that the members of all the organizations present believed it important to look at monitoring not only as it applies to individual specific projects, but also at trend monitoring in watersheds or with pre project monitoring. Another is to identify reference stream reaches and to begin doing monitoring in those stream reaches. There was an interest in looking at specific types of monitoring activities, including independent types of monitoring activities.

Mr. Carlton commented that there is a need to review and move forward with the MAA. It was the desire of the Liaison Committee to have staff do the inventory of the 1999 package, at the earliest possible date. He believes that getting the 303 (d) issue and the provisions of the MAA equipped to describe and define how a joint agency group is going to deal with those issues is a priority.

Mr. Marckwald wanted to know more about the voluntary monitoring aspect.

Mr. Lee commented that under CDF's authority it would need to be voluntary. CDF does not have the authority to require pre-project monitoring; monitoring in locations that could have special controls, but are remote from the actual site of the timber operation; or monitoring for extended periods of time following the conclusion of timber operations and the completion report. He noted that under the Hillslope Monitoring Program, which reviews for implementation and effectiveness, selection of timber harvesting sites has been at random.

Mr. Heald wanted to know the possibility of doing monitoring where there are spatial and temporal controls.

Mr. Lee commented that the type of GIS capabilities that CDF is developing in the Southern and Coastal districts, and are coming to the Northern District, is the type of database and information that can help address the whole cumulative effects question.

Chairman Dixon commented that he believes that there has been significant progress. The suggestion from Chairman Baggett that each board appoint a couple of its members to work together to line out a process for updating the MAA is a meaningful one.

Chairman Baggett suggested that the Executive Officers get together and seek two volunteers from each board for that meeting.

Mr. Marckwald commented that the matter is one that the Legislature believes is very serious. From a mutual perspective, both of these boards have a public duty to deal with whatever gaps might be there with respect to monitoring and cumulative effects.

Mr. Nawi commented that the Legislature also indicated that they wanted to see progress sooner rather than later.

There was some procedural discussion.

Mr. Rynearson wanted to know if the Department saw the MAA process as a way to help resolve some of the conflicts before they get to the point of non-concurrence.

Mr. Snyder believes that the MAA would have more effect once a non-concurrence takes place. It will affect the point after the second review rather than before second review.

Public comment

Mr. Richard Gienger suggested that the respective Boards are in a position to move forward so that there are comprehensive cumulative effects evaluations for each planning watershed. He read a passage from the Dunne Report into the record. There needs to be public trust. He urged the Boards' to develop site monitoring and procedures for site monitoring. He believes that there is a need for a team effort between the Resources Agency, Cal EPA, the Water Board, and the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. This joint Board should take the lead and establish adequate cumulative watershed effect analysis.

Mr. Mark Rentz, California Forestry Association (CFA), provided a copy of a report entitled, "Review of California Forest Landowners Riparian and Instream Water Quality Monitoring Programs." He commented that the cost of doing monitoring can be exorbitant. CFA urges the two Boards to keep in mind those costs and who will incur those costs. He commented that the waste discharge data was never analyzed or used. There needs to be a coordinated and a cooperative effort with landowners. This can be achieved by recognizing the MSG approach and build upon that effort.

Mr. Kevin Collins commented that the cumulative effects would not mean anything without the rate of harvest.

Ms. Jodie Frediani expressed concerns regarding the MOU and CDF being the lead agency. She commented that Santa Cruz gets all of its water from watersheds. There needs to be some changes made.

Mr. Bill Key, California Licensed Foresters Association (CLFA), commented that the waiver issue is a work in progress. He expressed concern about the Central Coast area and the difficulty in getting waivers through the Boards.

Mr. Frank Reichmuth, California Water Resources Control Board, believes that the concept of an MAA is a good tool. The Water Board is proficient in developing water quality standards and can define the beneficial uses that are instream, but have limited authority regarding the landscape. The MSG is a good document on hillside losses, but there is no link to instream uses. A linkage between hillslope and channel is needed. He noted also that a liaison team used to meet at least once a year and that he was encouraged by the joint meeting today.

Mr. Warren Alford, Sierra Club, commented that since the 1988 MAA was signed, almost every major stream on the North Coast has become impaired under the Federal Clean Water Act. He referred to various reports indicating that the environment was not being protected due to the flawed concept that ecology could be addressed on parcel-by-parcel basis. He believes that the process is broken and that the current rules have failed.

Chairman Baggett commented that he would like for the State Water Board and the Board of Forestry joint meeting to be an annual occurrence of both full Boards and also include involvement of the Regional Boards. As a state, there is a need to be concerned about the proper balance and how to approach it on a broader policy level. The Water Board can only set standards and relies on the Board of Forestry to make sure that Best Management Practices are effective and meet the standards of the Water Quality Board. That is the objective of the MAA.

Mr. Rynearson supports the suggestion of an annual joint meeting and commented that the more the agencies and the boards communicate the more issues will be dealt with. It is much better to have these issues resolved before non-concurrence. He believes that the unification of the waiver process would be of real benefit.

Chairman Baggett commented that there is a need for a consistent approach in the three regions regarding the waivers.

Chairman Dixon suggested that Director Tuttle also select representatives to attend the meeting with the members from both boards.

Mr. O'Dell spoke in support of the annual meeting between the boards. The issue of cost always comes up regarding monitoring. The monitoring issue is not a casual issue. There has been tremendous progress and commitment to monitoring. He believes that it is important to share the effort that has been made so that others can see the progress and benefit from it. There is a responsibility to share those efforts more broadly, but he wanted people to know that there has been and is a lot of monitoring that takes place. He spoke in support of revisiting of the MAA to make it a current and living piece that can be referenced. He complimented all of those who have worked in harmony so that business can go forward.

Mr. Nawi commented that the joint meeting and the signing of the MOU are very positive steps. The continuing efforts of the Monitoring and Cumulative Watershed Effects Working Groups as well as the revisiting of the MAA should keep the momentum going.

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Rynearson commented that the Ad Hoc Committee has been working on the Roads Management Plan and in March the Committee sent a letter to the Regional Boards, Department of Fish and Game, and NOAA Fisheries. The letter requested involvement toward the development of the Roads Management Plan seeking regulatory standards. He provided the members of the Water Board copies of that letter in the hopes of its consideration and possible support.

Mr. Marckwald commented that the Road Management Plan would be a voluntary effort, but one that would require a considerable commitment from landowners. It is important that every effort be made to get a document that is meaningful to the Regional Boards, the State Board, the Board of Forestry, and to the landowners.

Chairman Baggett commented that perhaps the Executive Officers could get together with Regional Board staff to follow up on that issue.

Mr. Rynearson commented that there have been responses to that letter from the Lahontan and the Central Coast Board.

Mr. Lee wanted to know the timeframe for his Board.

Mr. Rynearson commented that the Ad Hoc Committee is trying to get a 45-day notice out in July.

**MINUTES
BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
MEETING
June 5, 2003
Sonora, California**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dixon called the June 2003 meeting of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to order.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

Chairman Dixon commented that there was only one action taken in Executive Session, which he would report on under the Report of the Chairman.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Dixon asked for Board approval of the May minutes.

03-06-1 Mr. Marckwald moved to approve the April 2003 minutes as amended. Mr. Rynearson seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Dixon announced that the Board's Executive Officer, Daniel Sendek, would be leaving that position as of June 13, 2003. During the Executive Session, the Board appointed George Gentry as Acting Executive Officer, effective July 16, 2003, for a period of 180 days. He will also continue work in his capacity as Executive Officer for Licensing during that period.

Chairman Dixon congratulated Members Britting, Nawi, and Marckwald for receiving the recommendation of the Senate Rules Committee for confirmation as members of the Board.

Chairman Dixon commented that the field trip with the Water Board was excellent and the meeting that followed was valuable. He noted the issues discussed and commented that he and Member Marckwald would represent the Board in reviewing the MAA with representatives from the Water Board and the Department.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Ms. Andrea Tuttle, Director of the California Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), extended her congratulation to the newly confirmed members of the Board. She commended the Board for meeting with the Water Board, and thanked SPI for hosting the field trip.

Director Tuttle announced that Deputy Director for Resource Management, Ross Johnson; and Deputy Director for Forest Practice, Dean Lucke were retiring before the next Board meeting. Bill Snyder, a former Board member, would be taking over as Deputy Director for Resource Management at the Sacramento Headquarters bringing with him a wealth of knowledge. Duane Shintaku will be replacing Dean Lucke as the Deputy Director for Forest Practice. She then reported on CDF's six new Unit Chiefs from: San Diego, San Benito Monterey, Lassen-Modoc, Shasta-Trinity, Butte, and Humboldt. Rich Green will be replacing Rich Just as Assistant Deputy Director for Fire Protection.

Director Tuttle commented that fire season is open except on the North Coast and that the Department expects a busy fire season. However, there has been some delay with the aircraft rollout due to corrosion within some of the wing structures. She expressed concern over fuels due to the wet spring.

Director Tuttle commented that last week CDF flew the Governor over the Idyllwild and Lake Arrowhead bug infestation areas, and indicated that it made a real impression on him. She provided an update on the efforts in that area for the Board.

Director Tuttle reported on the Tahoe Fire Summit, a meeting of the California Fire Alliance. This meeting brought together agencies and residents to look at fuel management issues. The National Academy of Public Administrators (NAPA) was at that meeting to assess how California runs its program and was very impressed. CDF's database, the GIS layers, and also its network of Fire Safe Councils distinguishes California from other states.

Director Tuttle commented that she and the Regional Forester are now Co-Vice Chairs of the Council of Western State Foresters and will be taking office in November 2003.

Director Tuttle reported on the budget and explained the mandatory procedure for all departments regarding general layoff notices. It is not known if these layoffs will be necessary, but preparations need to be made. The layoffs would be on a seniority basis, should it become necessary. The general notices have been mailed out. She continued to review the remaining budget items for the Board.

Director Tuttle provided the Board with some background on the CDF Chaplaincy issue. This issue is currently in litigation and she will keep the Board up to date.

Director Tuttle commented on the letter from the Department that Board members heard about at their confirmation hearings. She explained and indicated that she would provide the Board with a copy of the Department's letter to the Chairman of the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors in response to a question asked of the Department regarding PALCO's SYP.

Director Tuttle commented that the Department is still using the NCWAP staff to help build the information base on watersheds, even though the program's funding has been cut.

Mr. Marckwald commented that he recently required the services of a fire support unit in a contract county (Marin) and was very impressed with the response time and the professionalism of the crew. He commented, regarding the letter, that the issue goes to a question of oversight and policy relationships. He noted that the Legislature has an expectation that the Board has an understanding of things that might affect broader policy direction. He believes that it is important that the Board is kept informed on those issues that might have a political dimension.

Chairman Dixon commented that the Board would work with the Department on this issue.

There was some further discussion.

Mr. Rynearson expressed thanks to the Department for all of the voluntary activities it is involved in that the public may not be aware of.

REPORT OF THE OAK MORTALITY TASK FORCE (COMTF)

Mr. Mark Stanley, Chairman of the COMTF, referred to the COMTF report in the Board's binder. The report is available at <http://www.suddenoakdeath.org>. He noted that there were a number of new findings of *Phytophthora ramorum* in various nurseries. The latest find is just south of Portland, Oregon and was found to have come from European shipments. There was also detection in four California nurseries including Stanislaus, Alameda, Santa Cruz, and Marin Counties on Camellias and Rhododendron. Even though *ramorum* is moving around, the regulators are spotting it and treating it. Training sessions are continuing and going very well. There are no confirmed locations in Humboldt County other than in Redway. There has been a request for CDFA to do a formal

survey in Redway to see the extent of the damage there in an effort to delimit the regulated area. Hopefully, Humboldt County will be designated "free from" except for the area in Redway. If successful, the COMTF will be able to look at other counties as well. He reported that the United Kingdom has been monitoring and have found 264 sites, mostly in nurseries and large landscape gardens. The Hoopa Tribal Council is pleased with the outreach and education offered by the COMTF. Their concern is with the traditional gathering of many of the host species. The Task Force is looking at ways to mitigate or treat what they currently do so that they can continue with minimal risks.

Mr. Stanley commented that a meeting was currently going on in Eureka with representatives from Oregon, the Forest Service, APHAS, CDFA, and CDF to decide what to do if there is a new find of *Phytophthora ramorum*. He noted that the On-line Symposium was very successful. He reported that he recently spoke at the Interagency Fire Safety Officers meeting in San Diego regarding issues related to SOD. Cleaning and sanitation policies were also discussed.

Mr. Marckwald wanted some materials he could provide the Senate Rules Committee on SOD. He commented that the SOD issue and the Lake Arrowhead issue have attracted non-partisan interest in the Rules Committee.

There was some further discussion.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES INCLUDING USDA FOREST SERVICE, NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE AND US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. Mike Chapel, USDA Forest Service (USFS), reported that later today the Draft Sierra Nevada Framework (SNFW) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be announced. The mailings will begin tomorrow and will be posted on the Web as well. On June 13, 2003, the SNFW project report will be formally noticed in the Federal Register, which will begin the 90-day public review process. Also on June 13, the Framework Interagency Team will meet. The contents of the draft Supplemental EIS will be discussed as well as a new initiative under the heading of Collaborative Adaptive Management in the Sierra. The goal will be to carry forward in an interagency format with public coordination, the management of the wildland urban interface in the Sierra Nevada.

Mr. Chapel commented that many of the 16 thousand comments received on the Draft Giant Sequoia National Monument document were in support and many took issue with the emphasis on commercial forest products. The Forest Service is now considering how it will deal with all that material and what it will include in the final EIS. He commented that the Forest Service has been taking interested parties, in small groups, to look at the Lake Arrowhead infestation area. There was a good discussion on how to deal with the controversy around the Giant Sequoia Monument (GSM) and how to move forward. It was agreed to pursue, within the next few weeks, the possibility of doing another collaborative adaptive management program for the GSM on the Sierra Nevada Framework. The Forest Service will be working with CDF's FRAP Unit and others and will keep the Board informed of the progress.

There was some discussion regarding timelines. Mr. Chapel indicated that it could take a couple of months to organize, with specific details coming several months later.

Mr. Chapel provided an update on the President's Healthy Forest Initiative. He commented that on May 21, 2003, HR1904, regarding fire restoration and forest recovery, passed the House and is now in the Senate. The new appeals rule will be published in the Federal Register today under the heading of Forest Recovery Projects. He noted that the Forest Service would soon publish new rules on categorical exemptions.

PRESENTATION AND REVIEW OF THE REVISED LATOUR DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLAN, INCLUDING RECOMMENDED MODIFICATIONS

Chairman Dixon introduced the topic.

Mr. Ross Johnson, Deputy Director for Resource Management, referred to the report in the Board's binder. He noted some clarification to page 24 of the document. He noted that there had been little change since the Board last saw the Plan. The Department went through the full CEQA process and there was only one comment, which came from Cal-trans indicating they were not going to comment. He reviewed the policy with the Board.

Mr. Heald commented that he would like to review the Plan a little more. He understood that the procedure was for it to go through Committee first. He believes that there needs to be a routine in the process and reviewed the process for the Members.

Mr. Johnson indicated that the Department was willing to take the document to Committee for discussion and review.

There was some further discussion.

Chairman Dixon asked that the item be placed on the agenda for July.

Mr. O'Dell commented for clarification, that the Board would be taking action in July as well.

Chairman Dixon commented that it was presumable.

BOARD DISCUSSION OF ISSUES RELATED TO THE HARDWOODS AND OAK WOODLANDS

Mr. Bill Stewart, Chief of CDF's FRAP Unit, introduced the presenters: Doug McCreary, Program Manager for the Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program (IHRMP); Janet Cobb, president of the Oak Foundation; Mike Laird, Tuolumne Planning Department; and Dennis Hall, CDF.

Chairman Dixon commented that the Board's Policy Management Committee had discussed this issue, and he would like Member O'Dell to provide some background on the process.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the Policy Management Committee (PMC) reviewed the history and recent changes with oak woodland across the state. It believed that this issue was of sufficient interest and importance to be discussed more openly in a public setting to gain input from the audience as to how best to continue. The Committee believed that it would be appropriate to discuss this issue during this meeting since the Board was in an area where oak woodland exists. The procedure for today would be for input from the panel and public followed by Board discussion.

Mr. Marckwald added that if the presenters identify a problem that is within the Board's jurisdiction, they should be as clear as possible as to what they believe this Board ought to do to address the problems.

Dr. Doug McCreary, program manager for the Integrated Hardwood Range Management Program (IHRMP), provided some background information regarding California's oak woodlands. He commented that about half of California's oak woodlands have been depleted in the last two to three hundred years. He reviewed some of the needs of the past for fuel and timber products. Currently, and for the last 50 years, residential and commercial development has had a huge impact. The issue of vineyard conversions of oak woodlands is continuing. In 1986, the Board began working to address this issue and has been supportive of the IHRMP. The IHRMP has been working with some of the issues that had been identified and there has been a lot of progress. He noted that very little range improvement clearing is going on at this time. In Tehama County, there is only one firewood harvester left. That market has slowed partially due to air control standards. There is more known today about how to regenerate oaks and about the impacts to wildlife. However, there are still

vineyard conversions, residential and commercial developments, and residual effects. He commented that approximately 80 percent of oak woodlands are in private ownership. He provided a handout showing the counties with significant hardwood rangeland acreage and the current policy approaches being used. He noted that housing and development is an issue in some of the counties. The IHRMP has begun a series of preliminary workshops to address these issues. The IHMP is also updating the Planners Guidelines, which was first produced in 1993. The Wildlife Conservation Act, which was passed in 2001, provides for eight million dollars for the purchase of conservation easements and is administered by the Wildlife Conservation Board and the California Oak Foundation. There are oak management groups that are interested in obtaining some of these funds. He believes that this will be an effective tool for conserving oak woodlands in California.

Mr. Stewart commented that increasing population with its attendant large infrastructure projects will impact oak woodlands. He noted that the Board is the only entity in the state that asked counties to develop oak policies and the IHRMP wants to keep track of those county policies. He reviewed the agents of change that are affecting the oak woodlands of California.

Mr. Mike Laird, Tuolumne Planning Department, commented that Tuolumne County's emphasis is on land development projects. The Tuolumne County Wildlife Inventory Evaluation Project was developed in 1986 and adopted by the County Board of Supervisors in 1987. This collaborative effort resulted in a consistent, fair, and cost effective approach to mitigating impacts on biological resources including oak woodlands. Approximately 78 percent of Tuolumne County is in public ownership, leaving approximately 330,000 acres in private ownership. Approximately 125,000 of those acres are under Williamson Act Land Conservation contracts. He outlined the details on Tuolumne County's wildlife habitat groups for the Board. He commented that one of the goals of the plan was to create corridors for wildlife movement from large blocks of habitat to other large blocks of habitat. He indicated that the Department of Fish and Game (DFG) has environmental review fees for development plans. However, if a developer voluntarily implements the Tuolumne County Wildlife Plan, the fee is waived. He commented that the Plan was approximately 16 years old and the County was in the process of updating it. He indicated that most of the agricultural land in Tuolumne County is used for dry land grazing. Vineyards are not common in the County due to the high cost of water. Most of the conversion in Tuolumne County is related to land development. He commented on the oak woodland management in the County and read a resolution adopted in 1995 by the County Board of Supervisors to enact voluntary guidelines and recommendations for sustained management of oak woodlands into the record. They also created a Rangeland Advisory Committee that meets once or twice a year to oversee and discuss the implementation of the County's policies on agricultural land.

Ms. Janet Cobb, president of the Oak Foundation, commented that she believes that there should be statewide oak woodland oversight due to the expected population growth. She indicated that the Governor has expressed that the Board is the guiding authority. However, she believes that the job is not getting done. The Oak Foundation has initiated SB 711 to provide for the regulation of oak woodlands. She provided an overview of the oak woodland situation in California for the Board. The Oak Foundation has asked that the Governor issue an Executive Order. The Governor says that it is the Board's job and she asked that the Board please do it.

Mr. Dennis Hall, CDF, commented on the definition of timberlands and stocking criteria. He believes that oak woodlands is a land use issue. He commented that the Department needs some strong guidance from the Board. If the Board decides to move forward with this issue, it could require a rewrite of the rules and possibly some legislation and increased staffing.

Chairman Dixon wanted to know how the Board wished to proceed.

Following some further discussion, Chairman Dixon asked Ms. Cobb if the Oak Foundation was suggesting that the Board reconsider the conversion process.

Ms. Cobb replied that it was.

There was more discussion between the Board and the presenters.

Chairman Dixon thanked the presenters for the informative presentation. He recommended that the Board refer the package to the PMC with recommendations or ideas, that the Committee consider it in July, that the Committee provide the full Board with options in August, and that the Board be prepared to provide some action at that time.

Mr. Heald wanted to know if the Board were to pass new regulations, what effects could be expected to existing rules or regulation.

Mr. Bruce Reeves, Deputy Attorney General and Counsel for the Board, commented that he would need to look at that to provide an informed answer.

There was more Board discussion and it was decided that the PMC would work on the issue in Committee in July and report then to the full Board. The item would go on the Board's agenda in August with options to consider.

Chairman Dixon commended the members of the PMC for the diligence in which they pursued the priority issues.

Mr. O'Dell commented that he wanted to express his highest compliments the people involved in today's discussion.

Chairman Dixon expressed his hope that any issue that comes before the Board could be deal with in this manner.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF THE "STATE OF THE FOREST PRODUCT INDUSTRY IN CALIFORNIA"

Chairman Dixon asked that Member Ryneerson provide an overview on this item.

Mr. Ryneerson referred to a letter from CFA addressing some of the issues. Last month there was no opportunity to discuss the item following the presentation. He suggested that the Board members and members of the public might want to take this opportunity to comment now.

Chairman Dixon believes that there are other elements involved in the industry's decline other than regulations. He wanted to know if the industry could clarify its regulatory burden and propose solutions.

Mr. Ryneerson referred to the letter from Soper-Wheeler addressing some of those issues.

Mr. Bosetti commented that most of the industry suffers due to global competition. He believes that there is a need for a process for review and approval that provides flexibility for a landowner to enter into the market place at an opportune time. The larger industrial landowners have the ability to weather some of the changes in the market. He believes that for the small landowners, the critical time is when the stumpage value is at its highest possible dollar amount. The current process can take up to a year or two to prepare a plan and then there can be limitations on the ability to operate the plan due to possible mitigations. He believes that the Board could look at options to send to the Legislature, which could provide for an emergency extension or extending the time that a THP is open to operate.

Mr. Marckwald commented that it would be helpful for the Department to give the Board a sense of the number of plans expiring without operations. He expressed caution of initiating a new effort at this time of the year. He would like for FRAP or some other economist to focus in on "basic economic forces."

Chairman Dixon concurred with Member Marckwald. He reminded the Board of its commitment to communicate with the Legislature.

Mr. Heald commented that there is no doubt that having a viable industry and its attendant infrastructure is essential to allow for resource management.

Mr. Mark Rentz, California Forestry Association (CFA), commented on regulatory costs in relationship to other global issues. He referred to the example of costs involved with the Fruit Growers plans in Oregon vs. California as presented last month. He then referred to the CFA letter of May 27, 2003, and reviewed it for the Board. Next he referred to the magazine he provided the Board and read a portion into the record. The demand for wood products in the U.S. is increasing. He commented that the regulations do not allow for survival in hard times and time is running out for the industry.

Mr. Bernie Bush, Simpson Resources Company, commented that he had previously prepared a summary of rulemaking by the Board. He reviewed his findings for the Board. He noted that the costs continue to go up. He believes that to get some relief, it would take a cultural change and asked for the Board's help. He asked that the Board stand up for the process and support it. He then commented on reports to the Legislature. He believes that it is possible to protect the public trust and remain competitive. It is important that the Board understand what is happening to the timber industry. He expressed a willingness to report next month on specific costs.

Mr. Dan Weldon, Forest Landowners of California (FLOC), agreed with Member Bosetti that the small landowner is greatly impacted. He commented that presenter Jim Able did not give the Board estimates of cost his presentation, but he will be prepared with the actual costs in the near future. The Buckeye Conservancy is going to ask the Board about a 10-year moratorium on new regulations. FLOC wants the Board to be advocates.

Mr. Peter Ribar, Campbell Timber Land Management, commented that the Fort Bragg infrastructure has been lost. The problem is competition with other states. There is a need for an applicant friendly process. This Board does control the regulatory mechanism. Additional rulemaking does influence both the cost of conducting business and any decisions made by timberland managers in future investments. He asked that the Board take that into consideration.

Mr. Bill Key, California Licensed Foresters Association (CLFA), commented that when a mill closes the public intuitively believes that the environment is better served. CLFA is concerned this belief is leading the state into bad choices. CLFA has an educational function in trying to inform its members on these. He questioned why Oregon has a federally approved Best Management Practices (BMP) program and California does not. CLFA is going to try to keep talking about how to achieve BMPs in forestry.

Mr. Ryneason commented that there should be a subcommittee to meet with the industry people. There is a need to stay focused and get feedback and have broader discussion. The Board has not heard recommendations on how to make the process more timely, cost effective, and efficient. He suggested that a two or four person committee be formed and indicated that he would like to be a part of that committee.

Mr. Marckwald expressed his concern regarding the Open Meeting Act. He wanted to know if it would be useful to gather the recommendations of two members and allocate the same amount of time at another meeting.

Mr. Ryneason commented that the Committee could focus on the issues and bring them back to the full Board.

Mr. Nawi commented that the PMC discussed the potential of performance-based regulations and how it would work and if it were a viable option. There was also some discussion of a long-term project and the potential of a thorough view of the Forest Practice Rules.

Mr. O'Dell believed that what Member Ryneason was trying to do was to keep the Board focused. Since this Board is a policy board it has an obligation to listen to the regulated public.

Chairman Dixon reminded the Board that his commitment to the Legislature was to keep an open mind and to look at every aspect of what comes before this Board and what lies within its purview. He would like to hear this issue out until the Board can decide what it wants to do.

There was some further discussion.

Mr. Heald commented that having a viable industry that can process materials is essential.

Mr. O'Dell believes that a subcommittee of the Board to listen, work through the options, and come back for a more thorough discussion with the full Board is a reasonable recommendation.

Chairman Dixon believes that a two-member committee could come back and represent to the full Board whatever they heard. He volunteered to server with Member Ryneerson on that Committee. He commented that he feels strongly about the message that was brought to the Board and believes that the Board has a commitment to further the dialog.

Mr. Marckwald commented that his comment regarding two vs. four members was driven by concern regarding the Brown Act.

Chairman Dixon indicated that he would like for the Board to move forward on this issue. However, the burden is on the industry to suggest areas that it believes that the Board could help. He noted that any rules that have passed were passed in a public process with public hearings. If there are areas that the Board has been remiss in, he wants to hear about it.

Mr. Rentz commented that CFA welcomes the dialog with whomever the Board selects for the Committee.

Chairman Dixon wanted to know if there were any objection to Member Ryneerson and himself as the two-member committee to meet with representatives from the industry.

Mr. Gienger objected to a two-member committee to discuss this issue.

Mr. Nawi commented that the more publicly the Board makes its deliberations, the more likely it will increase public acceptability of its recommendations.

Chairman Dixon wanted the Board's Counsel to comment regarding two-members of the Board as a sub-committee and potential violations of the Bagley-Keene Act.

Mr. Bruce Reeves commented that provided the two-member sub-committee returned to a publicly noticed meeting of the full Board to deliver whatever it found, he did not believe it to be in violation of the Bagley-Keene Act.

Mr. Nawi indicated that his earlier comment was in terms of policy only.

Ms. Britting wanted to know if there was another venue to have this discussion with more interaction by everyone involved.

Chairman Dixon commented that the problem is timing.

Mr. Nawi commented that he had no problem in doing it through a two-member committee, but believes that it should be noticed and accessible to the public.

Chairman Dixon commented that he did not have a problem with noticing the meeting, however, scheduling could be a problem. It is important not to get bogged down when time would be better spent on the substance of the issue.

Mr. Marckwald believed that the two-member committee meeting should be noticed. Anyone who cannot attend that meeting will be able to pick it up when the Committee reports back to the full Board.

Chairman Dixon asked Member Ryneerson and staff to set up and notice that meeting.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE BOARD

FOREST PRACTICE COMMITTEE (FPC)

Mr. Heald, Chairman of the FPC, commented that the Committee discussed variable retention and reviewed a document in draft form regarding definition and silviculture methods. The Committee will work with staff to draft a proposal on variable retention with options. The Committee will possibly have a recommendation for a 45-Day Notice for the Board by next meeting.

Mr. Heald referred to a committee of agency people from Department of Fish and Game, CDF, and Water Quality and noted that there was concurrence with the Director's letter to re-affirm the existing language of Class II Watercourse Classifications.

Mr. Heald commented that the Technical Committee has met on the electronic filing of THPs and the Department will provide a presentation with the methodology in August.

Mr. Heald commented that there was some discussion of the Department's technical rule change proposal to the Interim Threatened and Impaired (T & I) Watershed regulations. The Committee forwarded this item to the Board for consideration with a recommendation to notice the package. The Committee also recommends that the T & I rules be extended for two years (or a term equal to that proposed in the IWMA package) and suggests that it be noticed to coincide with the IWMA proposal. He noted that currently these regulations are due to expire on December 31, 2003.

Mr. Heald reported that there is no consensus on the proposed rule language addressing Deciduous Hardwoods.

Mr. Heald commented that there was no discussion on the Transitional Silviculture Method proposed rule change. Also, the Committee did not have a discussion regarding Forest Reptile and Amphibian Working Group proposal, which focuses on the protection measures for springs, seeps, and wet areas.

Mr. Heald believes it appropriate to wait for the *Ad Hoc* Watershed's Committee report before the Board makes a decision regarding noticing the T & I and the IWMA rule packages.

Mr. O'Dell wanted to know if August was the target date for electronic filing or for feedback.

Mr. Heald commented that it is his understanding that the August timetable is from the Board's initial request to come forward with an initial format that might be used as a test for electronic submission and review of THPs.

Mr. Snyder commented that the Department is looking at identifying the results of testing pilot applications of electronic documents. The Department hopes to be able to report back if there are any infrastructure issues between the agencies, the public, or plan submitters in terms of their ability to use the electronic documents and looking at ways of solving those issues. The Department is also hoping to look at the cost structure of expanding the pilot into an operational phase.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (PMC)

Mr. O'Dell, Chairman of the PMC, commented that the Committee revisited the oak hardwood issue and discussed if the protocol would be acceptable for subsequent presentations. The Committee will probably follow that same design in July for the old growth discussion and in August on the clearcutting issue. The protocol would be first the presentations; public input, Board colloquy and the issue is remanded back to Committee to a discussion of recommendations.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the Committee discussed the 2003 priority list. There was discussion regarding the definition of timberlands and the Department's difficulty in dealing with small tracts. It was discussed that possibly placing the administration of those small parcels into a more local control venue. The Department will provide the

Committee, no later than September, background facts and figures so that the Committee can proceed with a more detailed discussion.

Mr. O'Dell reported that the Committee also discussed the new processes for rule development and he listed some of the ideas that surfaced. Perhaps this is the stimulus needed to look at all the rules. He believes that it would have to be done in small increments and would be a long committed effort. He commented that Member Marckwald expressed his frustration that some of the rules or suggestions for rules end up in the committee and are not effectively dealt with. It is believed that if there were some guidelines about how long a package could be considered without affirmative action, everyone would be better served.

Mr. O'Dell commented that he would discuss with Member Heald the Post Fire Timber Harvest Planning item and then the PMC will have a better-informed discussion at its next meeting.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the PMC's last item on its 2003 list to deal with was the Native American Representation on review team issue. Public Member Gienger noted that it has been a high priority for some time. He indicated that the Committee is going to invite Dan Foster, CDF Archeologist, to brief the Committee on the Department's point of view regarding the integration of Native American perspectives for timber harvest planning.

Mr. Nawi recommended that when a matter is referred to a committee, it not stay there indefinitely. When it is referred to a committee, a deadline for action must be made.

AD HOC ROADS AND WATERSHED COMMITTEE

Mr. Rynearson, Chairman of the *Ad Hoc* Committee, reported that following some discussion, the Committee believes that the Interim Watershed Mitigation Addendum regulations should be extended for three years. He noted that one party was using the IWMA, a second party is committed to implementation, and a third is considering it.

Mr. Rynearson commented that the committee's recommendation was for the IWMA to be extended for a period of three years, and that the extension period be made consistent with the T&I Rule package.

03-06-2 Mr. Rynearson moved to put out for 45-Day Notice for rulemaking both the Interim Watershed Mitigation Addendum and the Interim Threatened and Impaired Watershed rules.

Chairman Dixon noted that Member Heald's Committee had recommended a two-year extension to the Threatened and Impaired proposed rules package.

Mr. Heald indicated that the FPC had recommended two years, however, it also recommended that it conform with the IWMA.

After further Board discussion, it was agreed to extend both packages for three years.

Mr. Heald seconded the motion.

Mr. Bosetti commented that there were some modifications to some rule language and corrections for the Threatened and Impaired and he wanted to know if those corrections would put the package out of sync.

Mr. Marckwald believed that the changes were incorporated into the package and it is subject to a 45-Day Notice.

Mr. Rynearson indicated that the motion incorporated those changes suggested by the Department.

All Members were in favor of the aforementioned motion.

Mr. Rynearson commented that the Committee had positive responses from NOAA Fisheries and others regarding the Board correspondence requesting agency participation in the development of a Road Management Plan.

There has been no response from the Central Coast or the North Coast Water Board. He reviewed the timeframe for noticing this package—it would need to be noticed during the July meeting.

Mr. Rynearson noted that there was a good discussion on the continued review of the draft Road Management Plan (RMP) outline. It was determined that it was a volunteer package, incentive based, and the RMP would be developed in lieu of current rules as long as it addressed the same issues. There is a desire to develop the RMP to address TMDLs, the Coho recovery issue, and a 4(d) rule. It is important there be a commitment from the agencies that control those processes. In an effort to meet the goals of reviewing the proposed regulatory language and to meet those goals it will be necessary to have an additional meeting of the *Ad Hoc* Watershed Committee. He suggested that it be held on Tuesday, June 24, 2003 from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Sacramento. The other agenda item for that meeting would be the Roads Rules package in an effort to identify some of the key issues in that package and prepare a 45-Day Notice.

There was some discussion regarding schedules. It was decided to meet on Tuesday, June 24, 2003, at 9:00 a.m. in Sacramento.

RESOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE (RPC)

Mr. Bosetti, Chairman of the RPC, noted that the reports from the Region Chiefs were in the Board's binder. There was a report from the U.S. Forest Service regarding a request made last month by the RPC. That report contained six items including a summary of fire-fighting capabilities in Region 5 for 2003; the communications strategy that was in place; a briefing on large air tanker inspection schedules; the Region Forester's accountability report; the cost containment strategy for 2003; and a summary of the projected output by unit for the Region. It is a bound report and copies were provided to Board members.

Mr. Bosetti reported that there were no Advisory Committee Reports this month.

Mr. Bosetti commented that the Committee continued its discussion and review of the 1996 California Fire Plan. The Committee will proceed with this review by looking at each objective separately.

Mr. Bosetti noted that there was some discussion on the status of the situation on Lake Arrowhead. The Forest Service is focusing on fuel reduction. The Regional Forester is looking at possible forest closure. He noted that many of those who utilize this area are bussed in, which makes the plans for evacuation in the event of a wildfire even more difficult.

REPORT OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEES

CALIFORNIA FOREST PEST COUNCIL (CFPC)

Mr. Scott Johnson, Chair of the CFPC, provided a copy of his report to the Board. He commented that on May 14 and 15, 2003, CFPC held a tour in the Idyllwild and Lake Arrowhead areas. He provided the Board with a CD containing the report of that tour. The CD also includes a copy of the presentation on the Southern California Bark Beetle infestation. The CFPC Weed Committee will hold a joint field tour with the California Forest Soils Council in the Auburn area on July 22 through 24, 2003. The tour information is available online at <http://www.caforestpestcouncil.org>. He noted that the CFPC Annual meeting date has been changed to November 13 and 14, 2003, at the Heidrick Agricultural History Center in Woodland. He will provide the Board with more details in August.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PFEC)

Mr. George Gentry, Executive Officer for Licensing, announced that the PFEC would meet on June 26, 2003. He reported that there were three action items for the Board. The following Registered Professional Foresters have requested license withdrawal: Brian Hirt, RPF 2729, Dawne Hirt, RPF 2739; Delmer Albright, RPF 1887; Blaine Cornell, RPF 1067; and Ernest Andersen, RPF 1493.

03-06-3 Mr. Ryneanson moved to accept the requests for license withdrawal per 14CCR §1608. Mr. Heald seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Gentry asked for Board action on the request for voluntary relinquishment of the licenses of Richard Holmes, RPF 282 and Bruce Bayless, RPF 1652.

03-06-4 Mr. O'Dell moved to accept the request for voluntary relinquishment as submitted. Mr. Ryneanson seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Gentry reported that Michael Evans, RPF 1896 has requested license reinstatement from withdrawal status per 14 CCR per §1608(d).

03-06-5 Mr. Ryneanson moved to accept the request for license reinstatement. Mr. O'Dell seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

Mr. Gentry noted the passing of Emory Escola, RPF 1622 and John Golsie, RPF 1611.

RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RMAC)

No report was given.

MONITORING STUDY GROUP (MSG)

Mr. O'Dell referred to the MSG update in the Board's binder. The Modified Completion Report Monitoring training for new CDF Forest Practice Inspectors was conducted on May 21, 2003, in Calaveras County. To date, a total of 80 people have been through the training, mostly CDF Forest Practice Inspectors.

Mr. O'Dell reported that progress has been made on the three cooperative Instream Effectiveness Monitoring projects planned for the upcoming winter period that are being supported by the MSG, CDF, and the Board. Instream sediment and turbidity monitoring equipment from six companies has been ordered and will be shipped to Campbell Timberland Management and Sierra Pacific Industries in the next few weeks.

Mr. O'Dell commented that the second California Licensed Foresters Association (CLFA) Watercourse Crossing Workshop was held on May 16, 2003, in Redding. Approximately 150 resource professionals attended the workshop. The MSG asked CLFA for these workshops based on hillslope monitoring results showing that crossings have frequent problems.

Mr. O'Dell noted that the next MSG meeting is scheduled for June 17, 2003, at the CDF Northern Operations Center in Redding.

PUBLIC FORUM

Mr. Richard Gienger believes that the NTMP report is very important and the Department needs make it available. He commented that the report on the Mattole River project involving stream crossing removal and road decommissioning project has been done. He believes that there will be a detailed report in the near future. He commented that the Coho recovery team has been working on a planning watershed basis. He reported that Friends of the River were successful in their appeal against the Sonoma County Water Agency.

Mr. Roger Mueller commented on SPI's use of the terms variable retention vs. visual retention. He believes that visual retention causes confusion and only served to increase problems with the local population. He urged the Board to look at future proposals for variable retention.

Ms. Lois Grisdale commented that the greatest numbers of people moving into the area are retirees and that 31 percent of the Counties income comes from tourism vs. one percent from logging. She believes that the increase of clearcutting has changed the Calaveras area.

Ms. Arlene Mueller expressed her appreciation for the Board's efforts. She has been a citizen of Calaveras County for 20 years and believes that the biggest change in the area is clearcutting from SPI. She expressed her concern for the wildlife in the area. She believes that there are other ways to deal with this issue. She urged the Board to have the courage to keep the Sierra Nevada alive.

Ms. Addie Jacobson spoke on behalf of Calaveras County Supervisor Marida Calloway. Supervisor Calloway believes that the issues that the Board deals with are very important, especially the oak issue. She believes that the timber issue is very important and she hopes that the Board takes it seriously. She and others are very concerned about the change in silvicultural techniques and believe that they could get the lumber for their needs through other methods. There is concern about the effects to water and the economy. Ms. Jacobson commented that they are all small landowners and that she believes that the Forest Practice Act says that you should look for the maximum sustain timber yield while considering the economic impact and water quality. She believes that the impacts should be looked at on a wider scale.

Mr. Bruce Castle provided the Board with his written comments and read them into the record. He addressed the policy of evenaged timber harvesting. He noted that he could not support Pacific Lumber's proposed variable retention standards with such low minimum basal area per acre retention. He believes that Pacific Lumber and Sierra Pacific Industries have failed to reach their goal regarding variable retention methods, and that the root-cause of the problem is the clearcut policy itself. He asked that the Board consider a policy change that would limit clearcutting and near-clearcutting to a fixed percent of the area of any THP.

Mr. Warren Alford, Sierra Club, commented that he does appreciate the efforts of the Board. He requested that the Board delay the discussion of the full Board on the challenges with the industry until the Sierra Club has had an opportunity to provide a presentation to the Board on the "State on the Environment" and possibly a tour from the environmental perspective. He commented on the need for the pilot project on cumulative impacts. The clearcutting issue has huge impacts and there is a need for a new rule package that will affect what is happening on the landscape. He believes that the Board has an obligation to help stop clearcutting in the Sierras.

Mr. John Buckley does not believe that the site of the field trip was representative of what SPI is really doing. He provided a handout of variety of reports related to evenaged treatments in various watersheds in Tuolumne County and reviewed it for the Board.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. Daniel Sendek, Executive Officer for the Board, commented that it has been an honor to serve the Board and thanked them for the support they provided him over the years.

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Mr. Nawi commented that the Senate Rules Committee requested comments from he and his colleagues regarding the Disable Veteran issue and asked Board staff to set up that meeting.

Chairman Dixon suggested that Member Nawi and others make an appointment with the Director to facilitate their understanding on the issue.

Director Tuttle indicated that she would be available for such a meeting.

Member Bosetti indicated that he would like to participate with Member Nawi in that discussion.

Mr. Ryneanson commented that the Board received correspondence from RPF Bill Solinsky regarding a policy interpretation issue in Humboldt County for less than three-acre operations. He asked that that letter be referred to Policy Management Committee.

Mr. Marckwald noted that he would not be on the field trip on July 8 in Aptos.

Mr. Gienger expressed his appreciation to Ross Johnson and Dean Lucke for their years of service. He extended his appreciation to Mr. Sendek and Jim Mote as well.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Dixon adjourned the June 2003 meeting of the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTEST:

George D. Gentry
Acting Executive Officer

Stan Dixon
Chairman

Copies of the attendance sheets can be obtained from the Board Office.